

Planning Application

13 SATCHELL LANE, HAMBLE-LE-RICE, SOUTHAMPTON, SO31 4HF

Representative	Address	Comments
Helen Pearce	22 THE BARTLETTS HAMBLE-LE-RICE SOUTHAMPTON SO31 4RP	The proposal is far too tall and will have a negative impact on views from the houses in Farm Close and The Bartletts. To convert the loft area into habitable rooms the applicant is proposing a huge new roof with a ridge line running parallel to the front of the property. This design is out of keeping with adjacent homes. At present the roof comes to a central point and the trees on the far side of the river can be seen either side of the apex. Visually this proposal will create a very large rectangular block of roofing, unsightly in itself, and blocking views to the river. The mass of this roof will also feel overbearing to people walking and cycling along Satchell Lane.
Eva Annika Tomlinson	20 SATCHELL LANE HAMBLE-LE-RICE SOUTHAMPTON SO31 4HE	Please note my strong objection to this over development; Over bearing size on the narrow plot. Too close to boundary on north and south sides. Higher than other buildings if to be three floors. No desing merit, only trying to squeeze and over sized dwelling in amongst exisiting older houses. No proportion to size of plot. Cuts out light from neighours, from north and south. Overlooking neighbours and gardens. Unsympathetic size for the plot and neighbourhood.
Helen Robinson	HAMBLE VILLAGE MEMORIAL HALL HIGH STREET HAMBLE-LE-RICE SOUTHAMPTON SO31 4JE	The Parish Council object to this application on the basis that this is over development of the site, out of keeping with surrounding properties, the balcony overlooks the neighbouring property, encroaching on privacy. The Council took note of the representation from members of the public.
Keith Hughes	17 SATCHELL LANE HAMBLE-LE-RICE SOUTHAMPTON SO31 4HF	The roof although the same height is going from pointed to a solid ridge line both south north and east west. This will appear from a distance a 3 storey building. This property is too large for the plot size on the edge of the conservation area. The balcony is impinging on the neighbours no 11 bedroom both privacy and noise. There will be less car parking than at the present and will not save on road parking as the road is controlled. Also considering the size of the house plus hard driveway how is rainwater going to get into the aquifer and not run into the drains.
Robert Thomas	19 SATCHELL LANE HAMBLE-LE-RICE SOUTHAMPTON SO31 4HF	The proposed development is out of keeping and out of scale with it's surroundings particularly in view of the close proximity of a conservation area. A large proportion of the plot is to be developed, most notably with a ground floor extension to the rear, projecting well beyond the two neighbouring houses raising issues of privacy and light deprivation. The balcony to the front appears to be very close to the upstairs bay window of number 11 and could affect privacy with added noise disturbance. I believe that the change in the roofline will make the property appear to dominate the street scene. I consider the proposal to be overdevelopment and will set an unwelcome precedent for the future.
Josh Phillips	11 SATCHELL LANE HAMBLE-LE-RICE	Planning objection

	SOUTHAMPTON SO31 4HF	The development proposal is not in keeping and is not in scale with the surrounding area and it's close proximity of a conservation area. Looking at the proposed plans, a large proportion of the plot is to be developed, and most notably the ground floor to the rear, this is going way beyond the two neighbouring houses, our house number 11 feeling positively dwarfed and hemmed in by the over development of number 13. The existing light and airy feeling in the back garden will be seriously affected by this planned development. The upstairs balcony is obviously planned to take advantage of the river views, whilst this is understood, the view is already there from the existing bedroom, any balcony will be very close to our front bedroom, causing concern on both noise and privacy, the balcony will look directly into our bedroom bay window. The proposed change in roof line will make the property over dominating from a streetscene point of view. We consider the the proposal to be an over development which will undoubtedly set an unwelcome and inevitable precedent for future developments...
Suzannah Vaill	BERMUDIANA 21 SATCHELL LANE HAMBLE-LE-RICE SOUTHAMPTON SO31 4HF	We are writing an objection regarding the proposed development to 13 Satchell Lane. As things currently stand Satchell lane is composed of a variety of different houses that form a cohesive group of unobtrusive housing. They have similar silhouettes that enable this difference and similarity to co-exist. Even the most recent new developments in the village end of Satchell lane retain a pitched roof shape allowing the skyline to have some cohesion. Our objection takes 4 parts: 1/. The proposed change in roof shape and outline as seen from the west and east elevations is box shaped and not the more consistent pitched roof shape seen along this side of Satchell lane. It completely alters the feel of the road as the square (box) shape feels dominating and intrusive in a way that is avoided currently in this area of housing, even where redevelopment has been permitted. The aesthetic juxtaposition of this pitched roof shape alongside the flat 'Art-Deco' shape of Crowsport helps create a 'quiet feel' to the housing in the street. As it is, the proposed development radically alters this appearance and would destroy this natural balance and quality in the current architecture of this side and end of Satchell lane. 2/. The proposed change in shape and size represents a greater than 60% use of the available space as floor plan. It extends too far back way beyond the backs of adjacent houses. We have to admit feeling considerable sympathy with number 13's direct neighbours as it will intrude significantly on their privacy. We feel this is totally unacceptable. To permit this risks damaging the harmony that is the general feel of living on Satchell Lane. This proposal is overdevelopment and surely exceeds current

		permitted changes in development size. 3/. We would be concerned about how the reduced light this extension towards the back would impact on the flora of these gardens. Good underground rooting helps retain and maintain the strength of ground areas and reduce the risk of subsidence. This area is already known to be weak and this proposal risks reducing a part of the structure that prevents damage. The proposed change in parking is not creating a solution to a parking problem as alleged in the proposal. It adds no new parking spaces, but moves them to allow further development of the ground space. 4/.The extension into the existing carport would require digging foundations that would risk moving the ground immediately next to the foundations of number 15 Satchell lane. We understand the groundwork started to date at number 13 Satchell lane has already created a new subsidence providing extremely concerning signs that removing established and deep seated flora from the vicinity of these foundations can cause major issues as suggested in point 3. The weak seam of ground around these houses extends as far as number 21 and (we believe) number 23 Satchell lane - who share our foundation. The movement of this ground at number 13 would move the whole seam worsening subsidence and the risk of requiring foundations to be underpinned along way along Satchell lane towards and beyond our house. Examining the building plans for the Cul de sac behind and slightly North West of number 23 and number 25 would prove that modern building regulation required greater foundation planning to avoid the risks of subsidence that were not planned for when these houses, between 11 and 23/25 Satchell lane, were initially planned and in the 1930's. Permitting this development has a real risk of disturbing this seam of weak ground causing material damage to our buildings. This risk was mentioned in the searches made during the purchase of 21 Satchell lane in 2007. Please consider these objections in your decision on whether to permit this proposed development.
Leanne Gibson	15 SATCHELL LANE HAMBLE-LE-RICE SOUTHAMPTON SO31 4HF	OBJECTIONS TO PLANNING APPLICATION: H/23/95847 (13 Satchell Lane) I am writing to object to Planning Application Number: H/23/95847. The application comprises of Single/two storey front extension to incorporate balcony, single storey side extension, new roof with gable ends to provide habitable accommodation, two and single story rear extensions, elevational alterations and enlargement to front parking area" I am the joint owner occupier of 15 Satchell Lane (next-door neighbour) and moved into the property on Wednesday, 16 December 2015. After carefully researching and reviewing planning application H/23/95847 (13 Satchell Lane) I wish to bring to your attention important matters sufficiently serious in themselves to warrant determination by planning committee (elected members), rather than delegated. I wish to object to planning application: H/23/95847 (13 Satchell Lane) for the following reasons and

		material considerations: Objection 1: That the design (computer-generated architectural visualisation is not to scale) proposes a single/two storey front to incorporate balcony, single storey side extension, new roof with gable ends to provide habitable accommodation, two and single story rear extensions, elevational alterations and enlargement to front parking area. Firstly, I object to the bulk and scale of this development because it will dwarf the adjacent properties (11 and 15 Satchell Lane) - resulting in an unacceptable loss of outlook and privacy; as well as adversely affecting the amenity of neighbouring properties. Objection 2: That the proposed single/two storey front extension to incorporate balcony; storey side extension and the single/two storey rear extensions; and the removal of roof (new roof) to provide habitable second floor accommodation (third storey) is forward of the two adjacent properties and is unacceptable in amenity terms because the pattern of overlooking is completely at variance with the existing. The proposal would precipitate an all-pervasive invasion of privacy (panoramic overlooking from the second and third floors) at the front and rear gardens of 9 to 21 Satchell Lane; rear elevations of 11 and 15 Satchell Lane; as well as the living spaces of neighbouring properties (both inside and outside the house) at Lukes Close, Farm Close and Marina Drive - all symptomatic of unacceptable over-development. Objection 3: That the lack of meaningful front garden and the predominance of hard surfaces, resulting from site clearance already undertaken in October 2021 (trees, shrubbery, foliage, hedging and other vegetation) and excavation that has already resulted in the loss of habitat in both front and rear gardens. Even prior to planning approval, the natural existing contours had been desecrated by site clearance and exacerbated by the creation of an unduly harsh environment that is out of character with the street scene/visual landscape. An exemplar of thoughtless instrumentalism; and as such is indicative of unacceptable overdevelopment. Objection 4: That the ground disturbance (instability) caused by excavating beyond the edge of the footing (south elevation of 15 Satchell Lane) and the car park (10m x 10m x 1.70cm excavation) will compromise ground stability and the structural integrity of the south elevation of 15 Satchell Lane (assured). Moreover, subsequent to the excavation of the front and rear gardens, removal trees (two x 8m Japanese Maple trees, and one x 10m Bay Tree), shrubbery, foliage, hedging and other vegetation, has disturbed the subsoil and precipitate structural movement (subsidence) of the south elevation of 15 Satchell Lane. Objection 5: That the design (art deco exterior/interior) proposes the use of the first floor as a living space with balcony; and that the pervasive use of glass would create a space where overlooking and noise would result in an unacceptable loss of privacy, amenity, and will impact negatively on the
--	--	---

		quality of life in my own surroundings and even more so the residents of 11 Satchell Lane (the effect would be immediate and direct). And, Objection 6: That the proposed development and design (bulk and scale) is not just visually intrusive and overbearing but would impact negatively (affect) on the heritage assets of Satchell Lane. In summary, I am objecting to planning application: H/23/95847 on the following grounds and material considerations: (1) External/internal design (layout) and appearance. (2) Land stability. (3) Overdevelopment. (4) Loss of privacy and amenity, and the negative impact on the heritage assets of Satchell Lane. OBJECTIONS TO PLANNING APPLICATION: H/23/95847 (13 Satchell Lane)
Mark Farwell	15 SATCHELL LANE HAMBLE-LE-RICE SOUTHAMPTON SO31 4HF	OBJECTIONS TO PLANNING APPLICATION NUMBER: H/23/95847 (13 Satchell Lane, Hamble, SO31 4HF) I am writing to object to Planning Application Number: H/23/95847. The application comprises of Single/two storey front extension to incorporate balcony, single storey side extension, new roof with gable ends to provide habitable accommodation, two and single story rear extensions, elevational alterations and enlargement to front parking area" I am the joint owner occupier of 15 Satchell Lane (next-door neighbour) and moved into the property on Wednesday, 16 December 2015. After carefully researching and reviewing planning application H/23/95847 (13 Satchell Lane) I wish to bring to your attention important matters sufficiently serious in themselves to warrant determination by planning committee (elected members), rather than delegated. I wish to object to planning application: H/23/95847 (13 Satchell Lane) for the following reasons and material considerations: subsidence, land stability and location of the boundary between 13 Satchell Lane and 15 Satchell Lane (Reference to the Planning Application only). Background and Context (Subsidence and Land Stability at 15 Satchell Lane) When we purchased 15 Satchell Lane SO31 4HF on Monday, 14th September 2020 (detached three bedroom, two-storey house consisting of cavity brickwork walls supporting a hipped tiled roof) we were required by the HSBC (mortgagee) and Towergate Partnership (insurers) to commission a ground stability survey and a structural survey for the purposes of reporting on matters of subsidence on the south elevation, east elevation, west elevation and the south/north elevation loadbearing wall – as well as the general condition of the property. It is worth noting that we were initially unable to insure the property (considered to be an uninsurable risk because of subsidence) but we eventually secured

		limited and very expensive high-risk coverage. In terms of situation, houses 7 to 17 Satchell Lane are situated on a bank (angle of repose 20o) and 15 Satchell Lane is situated 1.7m above road level; 10m above sea level (137m from the waters edge of Hamble River) and facing NXNE (70o). The structural survey subsequently identified from data derived from the British Geological Survey (BGS) and a site survey undertaken by a geotechnical engineer, that there is high potential for natural ground subsidence at 15 Satchell Lane (Category 4/5, BRE Digest 251 classification); and moderate to high potential for the area surrounding 15 Satchell Lane. Namely, Crowsport, Farm Close, Hamble High Street, Marina Drive, Satchell Lane (subsidence on the south elevation of 13 Satchell Lane) and Well Lane. Hence, there is a well-documented recurrent history of subsidence at 15 Satchell Lane, sufficiently serious to warrant interventions (ground stabilisation and structural repairs) on three separate occasions between 2002 and 2020. In the substantive, the report opined, supported by scientific evidence, that the structural movement on the corner of the south/east elevation and the loadbearing dividing wall (south/north elevations) is "progressive and longstanding", and "all associated with downward foundation movement [...] reducing the bearing capacity of the foundation soil thus leading to subsidence of the site" (p.8). To that end, CET Group Limited, on behalf of Cunningham and Lindsey and Torgate Insurance, subsequently extracted soil samples from six boreholes at the rear (west elevation) and front (east elevation) (2 x 3 boreholes) by way of deep-window sampling, and for the purposes of ascertaining the physical and compaction properties of granular materials (soil type) surrounding the footings of 15 Satchell Lane. The report consequently recommended an excavation free process of soil stabilisation involving bio-chemical engineering (epoxy resin injection) and eco-engineering (planting and seeding vegetation; and the installation of a soak away) to reduce permeability and increase cohesiveness of the soil to improve the overall stability. In addition, an integrated programme of subsurface monitoring was instituted before, during and after the completion of remedial works to examine the efficacy of the intervention (analysis of pore pressure and data derived from the calibrated tell-tales) by way of intermittent undisturbed soil sampling to determine the stability of soil structure. The most recent soil sample was extracted by a Torgate Insurance appointee (geotechnical engineer) on Tuesday, 4 August 2020 who reported continued mild decelerations resulting from soil stabilisation (proved). Hence, the subsurface ecosystem surrounding the east/south elevations remains very fragile, and we were strongly advised to obtain expert advice before changing the ground conditions in any way (such as building work, removing plants or shrubs). However, the applicants employed the services of a local land clearance company to excavate the site (13 Satchell Lane) of all shrubs, trees (30ft Bay tree and two 60-year-old Japanese maple trees) and foliage. This has subsequently had a detrimental impact on land
--	--	---

		stability along the south and east elevations at 15 Satchell Lane, resulting in the onset of movement (new subsidence cracks running diagonally across the corner of south/east elevations). The location of the boundary between 13 Satchell Lane and 15 Satchell Lane We are currently in legal correspondence with the applicants over the removal of a carport which is partly situated on our property. In consideration of the above I wish to object to planning application H/23/95847 (13 Satchell Lane, Hamble-Le-Rice. SO31 3HF) on the following grounds: Objection One: Land Stability and Subsidence (13 Satchell Lane and 15 Satchell Lane) i. That Eastleigh Borough Council reject planning application H/23/95847 (13 Satchell Lane, Hamble-Le-Rice. SO31 3HF) forthwith, and for no other reason than the scale of the proposed excavation will lead to ground instability - causing serious structural damage to 15 Satchell Lane. The application was submitted without an assessment of the likely consequences of a proposed single storey development of 2m x 7.2m adjacent to south elevation within 20cm of the boundary onto 15 Satchell where subsidence and ground compression is already known and documented (Cunningham & Lyndsay, 2002). Furthermore, there are no measures identified in the application to protect the structural integrity of 15 Satchell Lane. ii. That the applicant failed to provide an impact risk assessment for the proposed scale of the excavation by way of a ground stability survey, or even a preconstruction survey that includes photographs and a geotechnical report. Furthermore, the applicants did not consult with the owner occupiers of 15 Satchell Lane prior to submitting planning applications H/23/95847 and two planning application in 2021 and 2022 (one withdrawn and the second was rejected by EBC Planning Committee). iii. That the proposed 10m x 10m x 170cm site excavation for the carpark ("elevational alterations and enlargement to front parking area") involves the removal 150 tonnes of soil which will result in ground instability. This will exacerbate the pre-existing subsidence and possibly precipitate ground heave. The excavation will also alter the angle of repose (slope stability) on the east/south elevations (corner) of 15 Satchell Lane - the area most affected by subsidence (see Annex 1 in the full report sent by email). iv. That the footing for the north elevation (13 Satchell Lane) for the proposed 7.2m x 2.2m ground floor single storey extension; and the rear 3m (d) x 9m (w) x 10m (h) three-storey extension with gable end roof configuration (front and rear, and a transverse gable end roof extension (south/north elevations) is located on the diagonal fault line (subsidence) between the south elevation of 13 Satchell Lane (visible cracking) and the north
--	--	--

		elevation of 15 Satchell Lane (ground floor entrance, first floor stairwell and second floor ensuite) is located. Furthermore, the footing for the loadbearing dividing wall (south/north elevations) at 15 Satchell Lane is located on top of the diagonal fault line and has been the subject of two interventions (remedial works), including 13 Satchell Lane, for subsidence since 2002. Although now reinforced below the dampproof course level, a 3.5cm gap remains at the bottom of the loadbearing dividing wall and the inner cavity wall (90o). The disturbance caused by excavating the front garden (parking area enlargement) and excavating beyond the edge of the footing (15 Satchell Lane) for the foundations (single storey extension and the three-storey extension (north elevation) will compromise the ground stability and correspondingly the structural integrity of the south and east elevations of 15 Satchell Lane. And, v. That the footing (1m x 600mm) for the north elevation 7.2m (w) x 2.2m (d) and 5m (h) ground floor single storey extension (13 Satchell Lane) at the narrowest point (west) will not only extend 20cm to the boundary between 13 Satchell Lane and 13 Satchell Lane. (see Figures: 5,6,7,8 & 9) Objection Two: Over-development i. That Eastleigh Borough Council reject planning application H/23/95847 forthwith, and for no other reason than the proposal is opaque, 'not to scale', and without perspective or sightline (Visual Impact Assessment) in relation to the adjoining properties and the street scene. Furthermore, the planning application has clear disregard for the landscape resource (applicants have already cleared the site of all trees, shrubbery, and foliage); and subject to approval from Hampshire County Council, the applicants intend to excavate the front garden to enlarge the parking area without sensitivity towards the value attached to aspects of the visual landscape and street scene. Moreover, the sheer magnitude, extent, and scale of this proposal to increase the total habitable floorspace by 68% (benchmark norm is no more than an increase of 30%) is unacceptable given the 'magnitude of effect' on residential amenity, privacy, and outlook. Hence, planning application H/23/95847 is an exemplar of overdevelopment to the detriment of the character of Satchell Lane and neighbouring residents. ii. That the proposed development on the north elevation by way of a 2.2m (d) x 7.2m (w) x 3.2m (5m) (h) ground floor single storey extension with slopping roof; and the 3m (d) x 9m (w) x 10m (h) three storey extension is unacceptable for the following reasons: (1) Property Boundary: That the proposed development on the north elevation by way of a 2.5m (d) x 7.2m (w) x 3.2m (5m) (h) ground floor single storey extension at the narrowest point will terminate within 20cm the property boundary of 15 Satchell Lane. We commissioned a specialist boundary surveyors report in 2020 (when purchasing the
--	--	--

		property in 2020); and we are currently in legal correspondence with the applicants over the removal of a carport which is partly situated on our property. The specialist boundary surveyors report confirmed that the applicants' carport is built partly on our land. Similarly, the proposed single storey rear extension (9m (w) x 8m (d) x 3.5m (h) at the narrowest point (west) terminates 65cm from the boundary with 15 Satchell Lane. (See Figures: 9 &10) (2) Maintenance of South Elevation (15 Satchell Lane): That the proposed development on the north elevation by way of a 2.5m (d) x 7m (w) x 3.2m (h) ground floor single storey extension with a flat roof will prevent access for maintenance of the south elevation of 15 Satchell Lane. We will be effectively 'bricked-in'. (3) The Right to Light (including Sunlight) and Privacy: The right to sunlight, other than hospitals and educational establishments, is a qualitatively different entity than that of the 'right to light'. However, given the scale and magnitude of the proposal a Sunlight and Daylight Assessment should have been conducted at the beginning of planning and submitted along with the planning application. To that end, the three-storey extension on the north elevation (1.5m (d) x 9m (w) x 9m (h); first floor west elevation (rear) extension (3.5m (d) x 8m (w) x 3.5m (h); and the third-storey extension (roof reconfiguration) of 8m (d) x 8m (w) x 3.5m (h) are proposed constructions that extend 3m beyond the footprint on the west and north elevations and will therefore have a detrimental impact upon residential amenities, privacy (overlooking) and overshadowing (loss of light). (4) Loss of Amenity by Extending Beyond the Footprint: The east (single storey with terrace), north and west elevation extensions (three storeys; and including a second storey 3m (d) x 8m (w) x 8m (h) on the south/west elevation (bump-out); and a third storey extension (transverse new roof configuration) is a development that is 'forward' of the two adjacent properties (extends beyond the existing footprint at the east, west and north elevations. This is out of character, so too the design, with other two storey properties from 9 Satchell Lane to 19 Satchell Lane. Moreover, the proposed first-floor balcony and the first-floor rear extension constitutes an unacceptable intrusion resulting in a loss of privacy and the legal right to light for residents of 11 Satchell Lane and 15 Satchell Lane in particular. (5) Third Storey Extension: The third-storey extension (roof reconfiguration) is unacceptable. Other than the concerns about extending beyond the existing footprint by 2.2m (north elevation) and 3m (South elevation) and the transverse roof configuration (gable end) will result in the loss of light (overshadowing), amenity and visual intrusiveness; a third-storey extension would facilitate all-pervasive overlooking (panoramic) of living spaces of neighbouring properties (both inside and outside the house) as well the front/rear gardens from 7 Satchell Lane to 21 Satchell Lane; Lukes Close, Farm Close and Marina Drive - all symptomatic of unacceptable
--	--	---

		over-development. (See Figures: 1,2,3 & 4) iii. That Eastleigh Borough Council reject planning application H/23/95847 forthwith for reasons of land stability, subsidence and overdevelopment resulting in an unacceptable loss of outlook, privacy (no proposals to safeguard an appropriate level of privacy) and the amenity of neighbouring properties (particularly 11 Satchell Lane and 15 Satchell Lane) - contrary to the Local Plan and Residential Amenity Design Guidance. Summary of objections to planning application H/23/95847 are as follows: 1. Land stability and subsidence. 2. Negative effects on amenity (neighbours and community) due to overlooking (loss of privacy). 3. Overshadowing and loss of daylight. 4. Overdevelopment: Over-bearing, out-of-scale (68% increase habitable floor-space) and character in terms of appearance. 5. Adverse visual impact (intrusive) of the development on the landscape and locality.
Leanne Gibson	15 SATCHELL LANE HAMBLE-LE-RICE SOUTHAMPTON SO31 4HF	Please see neighbour letter from 15 Satchell Lane dated 04/10/2023
Keith HUGHES	17 SATCHELL LANE HAMBLE-LE-RICE SOUTHAMPTON SO31 4HF	The footprint of the amended proposed development is basically the same. Which i feel is too large for the plot. Satchel lane is almost semi rural with trees shrubs and plants between and in front of the properties which then lead on to the village center. This development will be basically wall to wall with both neighbours with no front garden. The rear flat roof extension should strictly be for access and maintenance as its use as a patio / decking area would overlook all the neighbours. The last report does not comment upon the ground stability and and such drilling piling and digging could precipitate further ground heave and movement. I still feel it is incorrect having a patio window almost abutting the next door master bedroom. The side extension to the North is also is further out to abut no 15 thus before making it a effectively solid block .
Robert Thomas	19 SATCHELL LANE HAMBLE-LE-RICE SOUTHAMPTON SO31 4HF	Contrary to the inspectorate's observations, the site section proposed and existing plans show the single storey rear ground extension protruding well beyond the limit of the existing conservatory. Furthermore the existing conservatory is set well back from the boundary of number 11 whereas the new extension will abutt this boundary along it's entire length with the consequential detriment described in previous objections. I cannot find any response to the concerns of the occupants of number 15 about the possible effects of groundworks in the construction of the single storey side extension. The new plans do not appear to alter the close proximity of the balcony to the bedroom window of number 11. The issues of noise and privacy remain.

		The reconfiguration of the rooflines is a welcome improvement but I still consider the proposed footprint of the house to be too big. I would also like to object to the short notice given to comment on these plans particularly at this seasonal time of year
Josh Phillips	11 SATCHELL LANE HAMBLE-LE-RICE SOUTHAMPTON SO31 4HF	We have only lived here since Feb 2023, one of the reasons of buying the house was its mature and peaceful gardens, and not being directly overlooked by neighbouring houses. The View from the rear garden is of traditional red brick homes, set way back from our garden, thus the peaceful and private feel of the house . Taking into account the new and updated plans, we feel contrary to the inspectorate's observations, that it seems that very little has changed. Granted the roof is an improvement and reduces the somewhat overpowering feel of the plans. The existing plans show the single storey rear ground extension protruding well beyond the limit of the existing conservatory. What's more the existing conservatory is set well back from the boundary of our house number 11, however the new extension will abutt our boundary along it's entire length with the inevitable consequential noise and foundation problems that have been described in previous objections, potential loss of light which is restricted from the large redeveloped house of number 9. There is a sense of space at the rear of our house , which will vanish and give way to a solid wall halfway along our perimeter fence if this goes ahead. In short we feel very strongly that this is still an over permitted development , given the size of the existing house and rear garden, will make our house feel positively dwarfed in comparison to the neighbouring houses. We DO NOT relish A- the endless noise from construction work. B- noise, I am a composer and was looking forward to writing music in the existing summer house in number 11. C- being overlooked at the front of the house from the proposed balcony. The new plans do not appear to alter the close proximity of the balcony to the front bedroom bay window of number 11. The issues of noise and privacy remain, short of the addition of privacy glass, which whilst maybe visually obscured is certainly not acoustically, and if this is still an entertainment area, having someone or a few people potentially socialising with laughter and conversation merely a few feet from our bed is not something we desire into the early hours. With Christmas around the corner I feel I haven't really got the time to go into more depth, the short notice given to comment on these plans is somewhat inconvenient if not deliberate, many people are away or busy and it's easy to take ones eye off the ball at this time.

		I would suggest spring is the time to look into this with site meetings with the proposed developer and the chance to actually talk things over.
Mark Farwell	15 SATCHELL LANE HAMBLE-LE-RICE SOUTHAMPTON SO31 4HF	Dear Sir/Madam, Re: Planning Application Number: H/23/95847 (13 Satchell Lane, Hamble-Le-Rice. SO31 4HF) I am writing to object to Planning Application Number: H/23/95847. The application comprises of "Single/two storey front extension to incorporate balcony, single storey side extension, two and single storey rear extensions, elevational alterations and enlargement to front parking area (Amended plans and description)." I am the joint owner occupier of 15 Satchell Lane (next-door neighbour) and moved into the property on Wednesday, 16 December 2015. After carefully researching and reviewing the amended planning application H/23/95847 (13 Satchell Lane) I wish to bring to your attention three important matters sufficiently serious in themselves to warrant determination by planning committee (elected members), rather than delegated powers to the Bursledon, Hamble and Hound Local Area Committee, for the following reasons: subsidence, land stability and location of the boundary between 13 Satchell Lane and 15 Satchell Lane (Reference to the Planning Application only). Background and Context (Subsidence and Land Stability at 15 Satchell Lane) When we purchased 15 Satchell Lane SO31 4HF on Monday, 14th September 2020 (detached three bedroom, two-storey house consisting of cavity brickwork walls supporting a hipped tiled roof) we were required by the HSBC (mortgagee) and Towergate Partnership (insurers) to commission a ground stability survey and a structural survey for the purposes of reporting on matters of subsidence on the south elevation, east elevation, west elevation and the south/north elevation loadbearing wall – as well as the general condition of the property. It is worth noting that we were initially unable to insure the property (considered to be an uninsurable risk because of subsidence) but we eventually secured limited and very expensive high-risk coverage. In terms of situation, houses 7 to 17 Satchell Lane are situated on a bank (angle of repose 20o) and 15 Satchell Lane is situated 1.7m above road level; 10m above sea level (137m from the Hamble River waters edge) and facing NXNE (70o). The structural survey subsequently identified from data derived from the British Geological Survey (BGS) and a site survey undertaken by a geotechnical engineer, that there is high potential for natural ground subsidence at 15 Satchell Lane (Category 4/5, BRE Digest 251 classification); and moderate to high potential for the area surrounding 15 Satchell Lane. Namely, Crowsport, Farm Close, Hamble High Street, Marina Drive, Satchell Lane (subsidence on the south elevation of 13 Satchell Lane) and Well Lane. Hence, there is a well-documented recurrent history of subsidence at 15 Satchell Lane, sufficiently serious to warrant interventions (ground stabilisation and structural repairs) on three separate occasions

		between 2002 and 2020. In the substantive, the report opined, supported by scientific evidence, that the structural movement on the corner of the south/east elevation and the loadbearing dividing wall (south/north elevations) is “progressive and longstanding”, and “all associated with downward foundation movement [...] reducing the bearing capacity of the foundation soil thus leading to subsidence of the site” (p.8). To that end, CET Group Limited, on behalf of Cunningham and Lindsey and Torgate Insurance, subsequently extracted soil samples from six boreholes at the rear (west elevation) and front (east elevation) (2 x 3 boreholes) by way of deep-window sampling, and for the purposes of ascertaining the physical and compaction properties of granular materials (soil type) surrounding the footings of 15 Satchell Lane. The report consequently recommended an excavation free process of soil stabilisation involving bio-chemical engineering (epoxy resin injection) and eco-engineering (planting and seeding vegetation; and the installation of a soak away) to reduce permeability and increase cohesiveness of the soil to improve the overall stability. In addition, an integrated programme of subsurface monitoring was instituted before, during and after the completion of remedial works to examine the efficacy of the intervention (analysis of pore pressure and data derived from the calibrated tell-tales) by way of intermittent undisturbed soil sampling to determine the stability of soil structure. The most recent soil sample was extracted by a Torgate Insurance appointee (geotechnical engineer) on Tuesday, 4 August 2020 who reported continued mild decelerations resulting from soil stabilisation (proved). Hence, the subsurface ecosystem surrounding the east/south elevations remains very fragile, and we were strongly advised to obtain expert advice before changing the ground conditions in any way (such as building work, removing plants or shrubs). However, the applicants employed the services of a local land clearance company to excavate the site (13 Satchell Lane) of all shrubs, trees (30ft Bay tree and two 60-year-old Japanese maple trees) and foliage. This has subsequently had a detrimental impact on land stability along the south and east elevations at 15 Satchell Lane, resulting in the onset of movement (new subsidence cracks running diagonally across the corner of south/east elevations; and including the destruction of wildlife habitat. The location of the boundary between 13 Satchell Lane and 15 Satchell Lane We are currently in legal correspondence with the applicants over the removal of a carport which is partly situated on our property. In consideration of the above I wish to object to planning application H/23/95847 (13 Satchell Lane, Hamble-Le-Rice. SO31 3HF) on the following grounds: Objection One: Land Stability and Subsidence (13 Satchell Lane and 15 Satchell Lane)
--	--	---

		i. That Eastleigh Borough Council reject planning application H/23/95847 (13 Satchell Lane, Hamble-Le-Rice. SO31 3HF) forthwith, and for no other reason than the scale of the proposed excavation will lead to ground instability - causing serious structural damage to 15 Satchell Lane. The application was submitted without an assessment of the likely consequences of a proposed height extended single storey development of 2m (w) x 7m (length) x 5m (h) adjacent to south elevation (the original proposal extending 40cm over the boundary onto 15 Satchell) where subsidence and ground compression is already known and documented (Cunningham & Lyndsay, 2002). Moreover, the "compromise" proposal in its current form would not comply (height) with rules of PD rules, and at the rear of the extension would only leave a 30cm gap to the boundary of 15 Satchell Lane. Disappointingly, for the third time in a row the applicants have failed to identify measures in the application to protect the structural integrity, especially the south elevation of 15 Satchell Lane. ii. Hence, the applicants have now failed on three separate occasions to commission an impact risk assessment (ground stability survey) for the proposed scale of the excavation, or even a preconstruction survey that includes photographs and a geotechnical report. Moreover, the applicants did not consult with either of the owner occupiers at 11 and 15 Satchell Lane prior to submitting planning applications H/21/91232 (withdrawn) and H/22/94226 (refused) or prior to the current application H/23/95847. iii. Furthermore, the proposed 10m x 10m x 170cm site excavation for the carpark ("alterations to site frontage to enlarge parking area"), including excavating 0.5m beyond the boundary between 15 and 13 Satchell Lane, involves the removal 150 tonnes of soil which will result in ground instability. This will exacerbate the pre-existing subsidence and possibly precipitate ground heave. The excavation will also alter the angle of repose (slope stability) on the east/south elevations (corner) of 15 Satchell Lane - the area most affected by subsidence (see Annex 1 in the full report sent by email). And, iv. That the footing (1m x 60cm) for the north elevation (13 Satchell Lane), located 30cm from the boundary, for the proposed height extended single storey development of 2m (w) x 7m (length) x 5m (h) (porch) and the ground floor rear entrance is located on the diagonal fault line (subsidence) between the south elevation of 13 Satchell Lane (visible cracking) and the north elevation of 15 Satchell Lane (24m in length). Furthermore, the footing for the loadbearing dividing wall (south/north elevations) at 15 Satchell Lane is located on top of the diagonal fault line and has been the subject of two interventions (remedial works), including 13 Satchell Lane, for subsidence since 2002. Although now reinforced below the damp-proof course level, a 3.5cm gap remains at the bottom of the loadbearing dividing wall and the inner cavity wall (90o). The disturbance caused by
--	--	--

		excavating the front garden (parking area enlargement) and excavating up to edge of the footing (15 Satchell Lane) for the foundations (single storey extension and the (partial) two-storey rear extension with balcony (corner of the west /north elevation) will compromise the ground stability and correspondingly the structural integrity of the south and west elevations of 15 Satchell Lane. (Figures: 5,6,7,8 & 9) Objection Two: Overdevelopment i. That Eastleigh Borough Council reject planning application H/23/95847 forthwith, and for no other reason than the proposal is opaque, 'not to scale' (particularly the Tony Holt Design 'Site Plan'), and without perspective or sightline (Visual Impact Assessment) in relation to the adjoining properties and the street scene. Furthermore, the planning application has clear disregard for the landscape resource (applicants have already cleared the site of all trees, shrubbery, and foliage); and subject to one condition from Hampshire County Council, the applicants intend to excavate the front garden to enlarge the parking area without sensitivity towards the value attached to aspects of the visual landscape and street scene. Moreover, the sheer magnitude, extent, and scale of this proposal to increase the total habitable floorspace by 59% (benchmark norm is no more than an increase of 30%) is unacceptable given the 'magnitude of effect' on residential amenity, privacy, and outlook. Hence, amended planning application H/23/95847 in an exemplar of overdevelopment to the detriment of the character of Satchell Lane (street scene) and neighbouring residents. Indeed, the Planning Inspectorate Report (V2.0), 13 Satchell Lane Planning Statement, erred when concluding "that the [proposed] change would not affect the significance of HCA as a whole and would be harmful to its setting". The narrative justification, that no's 3 and 9 Satchell Lane are "far more contemporary in appearance" is a false comparison because no's 3 and 9 Satchell Lane were formerly single storey dwellings (bungalows). However, no's 11, 13, 15 and 17 (including 19 Satchell Lane) were all built between 1928 and 1931 as two storey detached houses; on the same sightline (front and back), and design ('Mock Tudor' facia on 13 and 15 Satchell Lane). (1) Property Boundary: That the proposed development on the north elevation by way of a 2m (d) x 7m (w) x 5m (h) ground floor single storey extension (porch) at the narrowest point is only 30cm from the property boundary of 15 Satchell Lane. We commissioned a specialist boundary surveyors report in 2020 (when purchasing the property in 2020); and have been in legal correspondence with the applicants over the removal of a carport which is partly situated on our property. The specialist boundary surveyors report confirmed that the applicants' carport is built partly on our land. Similarly, the proposed single storey rear extension (7m (w) x 8m (l) x 3m (h) at the narrowest point (west) terminates 65cm from the boundary with 15 Satchell Lane. (See Figures: 9 &10)
--	--	--

		(2) Maintenance of South Elevation (15 Satchell Lane): That the proposed development on the north elevation by way of a 2m (d) x 7m (w) x 5m (h) ground floor single storey extension will prevent access for maintenance purposes of south/east elevation corner of 15 Satchell Lane where subsidence is at its worst. We will be effectively 'bricked-in'. (3) The Right to Light (including Sunlight) and Privacy: The right to sunlight, other than hospitals and educational establishments, is a qualitatively different entity than that of the 'right to light'. However, given the scale and magnitude of the proposal a Sunlight and Daylight Assessment should have been conducted at the beginning of planning process and submitted along with the planning application. To that end, the (part) two-storey rear extension on the west elevation (rear) (3m (d) x 7.5m (w) x 5m (h); and the single storey flat roof extension of 8m (d) x 7.5 (w) x 3m (h) extend 3m beyond the footprint on the first west and north elevations and will therefore have a detrimental impact upon residential amenities, privacy (overlooking) and overshadowing (loss of light) of both 11 and 15 Satchell Lane. 15 Satchell Lane is deprived of light in morning (East) and 11 Satchell Lane on the afternoon (west). (4) Loss of Amenity by Extending Beyond the Footprint: The east, north and west elevation extensions (13 Satchell Lane), especially the 3m x 5m 'bump-out' rear extension, constitute a development that is 'forward' of the two adjacent properties (extends beyond the existing footprint at the east, west and north elevations. This is out of character, so too the design, with other two storey properties from number 9 Satchell Lane to 19 Satchell Lane. Hence, the proposed extensions are an unacceptable intrusion resulting in a loss of privacy and the legal right to light for residents of 11 Satchell Lane and 15 Satchell Lane. (5) Two-Storey Extension: The two-storey extension is unacceptable. Other than the concerns about extending beyond the existing footprint by 3m 'bump out' (side and rear) and the loss of light (overshadowing), amenity and visual intrusiveness; the extension front and rear facilitates an all-pervasive overlooking (panoramic) of living spaces of neighbouring properties (especially both 11 Satchell Lane) as well the front/rear gardens from 7 Satchell Lane to 21 Satchell Lane; Lukes Close, Farm Close and Marina Drive - all symptomatic of unacceptable over-development. (See Figures: 1,2,3 & 4) ii. That Eastleigh Borough Council reject planning application H/23/95847 forthwith for reasons of land stability, subsidence and overdevelopment resulting in an unacceptable loss of outlook, privacy (no proposals to safeguard an appropriate level of privacy) and the amenity of neighbouring properties (particularly 11 Satchell Lane and 15 Satchell Lane) - contrary to the Local Plan and Residential Amenity Design Guidance.
--	--	---

		Summary of objections to planning application H/23/95847 are as follows: 1. Land stability and subsidence. 2. Negative effects on amenity (neighbours and community) due to overlooking (loss of privacy). 3. Overshadowing and loss of daylight. 4. Overdevelopment: Over-bearing, out-of-scale (59% increase habitable floorspace) and character in terms of appearance. 5. Adverse visual impact (intrusive) of the development on the landscape and locality. Dr M Farwell Owner Occupier 15 Satchell Lane Hamble-Le-Rice SO31 4HF
Leanne Gibson	15 SATCHELL LANE HAMBLE-LE-RICE SOUTHAMPTON SO31 4HF	Dear Sir/Madam, Objections to planning application: H/23/95847 (13 Satchell Lane) I am writing to object to Planning Application Number: H/23/95847. The application comprises of "Single/two storey front extension to incorporate balcony, single storey side extension, two and single storey rear extensions, elevational alterations and enlargement to front parking area (Amended plans and description)." I am the joint owner occupier of 15 Satchell Lane (next-door neighbour) and moved into the property on Wednesday, 16 December 2015. After carefully researching and reviewing planning application H/23/95847 (13 Satchell Lane) I wish to bring to your attention important matters sufficiently serious in themselves to warrant determination by planning committee (elected members), rather than delegated. I wish to object to planning application: H/23/95847 (13 Satchell Lane) for the following reasons and material considerations: Objection 1: That the design (computer-generated architectural visualisation is not to scale) proposes two-storey front extension with balcony (overlooking 11 Satchell Lane); single and two storey rear extensions - together with alterations to site frontage to enlarge parking area. Firstly, I object to the bulk and scale of this development because it will dwarf the adjacent properties – resulting in an unacceptable loss of outlook and privacy; as well as adversely affecting the amenity of neighbouring properties. Objection 2: That the proposed single storey front; and single and two storey rear extensions; is forward of the two adjacent properties and is unacceptable in amenity terms because the pattern of overlooking is completely at variance with the existing. The proposal would precipitate an all-pervasive invasion of privacy (panoramic overlooking of the front and rear gardens of 9 to 21 Satchell Lane; rear elevations of 11 and 15 Satchell Lane; as well as the living spaces of neighbouring properties (both inside and outside the house) at Lukes Close, Farm Close and Marina Drive - all symptomatic of unacceptable over-development.

		Objection 3: That the lack of meaningful front garden and the predominance of hard surfaces, resulting from site clearance already undertaken in October 2021 (trees, shrubbery, foliage, hedging and other vegetation) and excavation would/has resulted in the loss of habitat in both front and rear gardens. Even prior to any planning approval, the natural existing contours had been desecrated by site clearance and exacerbated by the creation of an unduly harsh environment that is out of character with the street scene/visual landscape. An exemplar of thoughtless instrumentalism; and as such is indicative of unacceptable overdevelopment. Objection 4: That the ground disturbance (instability) caused by excavating beyond the edge of the footing (south elevation of 15 Satchell Lane) and the car park (10m x 10m x 1.70cm excavation) will compromise ground stability and the structural integrity of the south elevation of 15 Satchell Lane (assured). Objection 5: That the exterior design and created spaces (building beyond the footprint) has resulted in an unacceptable loss of privacy, amenity, and will impact negatively on the quality of life in my own surroundings and the residents of 11 Satchell Lane (immediate and direct). And, Objection 6: That the proposed development and design (bulk and scale) is not just visually intrusive and overbearing but would impact negatively (affect) on the heritage assets of Satchell Lane. In summary, I am objecting to planning application: H/23/95847 on the following grounds and material considerations: External/internal design (layout) and appearance. Land stability. Overdevelopment. Loss of privacy and amenity, and the negative impact on the heritage assets of Satchell Lane. Ms Gibson Owner Occupier 15 Satchell Lane Hamble-Le-Rice SO31 4HF
--	--	---